



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,377	01/02/2004	Yoshinori Utsunomiya	121.1061	9136
21171	7590	02/11/2008		
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER DANNEMAN, PAUL	
			ART UNIT 3627	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/11/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/749,377

Applicant(s)

UTSUNOMIYA ET AL.

Examiner

PAUL DANNEMAN

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 5 and 7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 5 and 7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

ETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 29 October 2007 has been entered.

Preliminary Remarks

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Priority

3. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Japan on 27 September 2002. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the Japanese application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Status of Claims

4. Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 are pending and have been examined.
5. Claims 2, 4, and 6 have cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious

Art Unit: 3627

at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. **Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redlich et al. (US Pub 2005/0132070 A1) henceforth known as Redlich in further view of Bray and Thompson.

9. **Examiner's note:** Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art of record in the body of this action for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply. Applicant, in preparing the response, should consider fully the **entire** reference as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the content of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Claim 1, 3, 5 and 7:

With regard to the limitations:

- *Parsing a document with regards to a non-disclosure dictionary containing a character string and a reason for replacement.*
- *Converting original document to an XML formatted document and providing an auxiliary storage unit.*
- *Embedding a tag in place of the character string.*

- *Replacing the character string with a meaningless character string when the document is retrieved.*
- *Meaningless character string is obtained from compulsory dictionary.*

Redlich in at least paragraph [0163] and Fig.1A discloses passing or parsing (Redlich, paragraph [0042]) a source document (data object) through a filter. The data object may be, e.g., test, images, icons, moving images, multiple images, data representing sound, video, etc. and is broadly defined as any item that can be represented in an electronic format and can be manipulated by a computer. The filter in the simplest sense separates uncommon text (remained data) from common text where text can be words, characters, icons or data objects and may be performed when the data object is created, saved, periodically, automatically, per user command, etc.(paragraph [0172]). The security sensitive words, characters, icons or data objects (Redlich, paragraph [0034]) are separated from remained or common word "text" and may utilize a dictionary. Redlich in at least paragraph [0170] further discloses enhancing the program's ability to locate security sensitive words or characters by using a properly dissected telephone book, a compilation of scientific words, or words unique to a certain industry, or country. Redlich in at least paragraph [0164, 0165, 169, and 0239] and Fig.19 further discloses additional features or options (security levels, multiple storage areas, and encryption and decryption routines) which one or more filters may contain with regards to text extraction and replacement.

Redlich in at least paragraph [0054] discloses that the present invention may also be configured to automatically secure structured documents and transactional documents like database records or XML documents (input documents). Redlich in at least paragraph [0045, 0047, and 0166] and Fig.1A discloses storing the common text or the remainder data in common storage memory or computer storage locations.

Redlich in at least paragraph [0274] discloses the automatic separation of data objects within a data stream into two or more digital data streams according to the importance and categorization of contents, through extraction and removal of the prioritized content and its replacement by appropriate placeholders (paragraph [0222]) with the intent of customizing of selected contents

within a data stream to different parties. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that parsing a document through a filter with extensive capabilities to search and separate strings of text based on some filter rules or characteristics is similar to applicant's use of a dictionary to contain a character string that will be searched and replaced with an embedded tag.

Redlich does not explicitly disclose the character string being replaced by a meaningless character string when a document is retrieved per se. However, Bray in at least page 3 discloses the structure of XML documents and the use of an XML processor to read XML data and in at least page 9 (last 3 lines) defines an XML document type declaration that provides a grammar for a class of documents. The grammar is known as a document type definition (DTD) that can point to an external subset containing markup declarations or can contain the markup declaration directly in an internal subset, or can do both (Bray, page 10). Thompson in at least page 1 defines an XML Schema (extends the capabilities of DTDs) which offers facilities for describing the structure and constraining the contents of XML documents when they are retrieved or displayed. Therefore, it would be obvious at the time of the invention, to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that by parsing (retrieving) XML documents along with the DTD and or Schema and changing the appearance of particular data is a standard feature when using and retrieving XML documents; and any results are not unpredictable.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
 - Lapalme et al. 2003. XML Based Multilingual Authoring, pages 1-9. Teaches character string search and replacement.
11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PAUL DANNEMAN whose telephone number is (571)270-1863. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. 6AM-5PM Fri. off.

Art Unit: 3627

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Florian Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Paul Danneman/

Examiner, Art Unit 3627

1 February 2008

/F. Ryan Zeender/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627